CV, PATENT

U.S. District Court District of Minnesota (DMN) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 0:08-cv-05275-JNE-JJK Internal Use Only

ADC Telecommunications, Inc. v. ATX Incorporated et al Assigned to: Judge Joan N. Ericksen Referred to: Magistrate Judge Jeffrey J. Keyes Cause: 15:1126 Patent Infringement

Plaintiff

ADC Telecommunications, Inc.

Patent No. 7,197,294

Patent No. 6,650,885

Patent No. 6,289,210

Date Filed: 09/26/2008
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 830 Patent
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

represented by Alan G Carlson

Carlson Caspers Vandenburgh & Lindquist 225 S 6th St Ste 3200 Mpls, MN 55402 612-436-9616 Fax: 612-436-9605 Email: acarlson@ccvl.com LEAD ATTORNEY ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

James R Hietala, Jr

Carlson Caspers Vandenburgh & Lindquist 225 S 6th St Ste 3200 Mpls, MN 55402 612-436-9600 Fax: 612-436-9605 Email: jhietala@ccvl.com LEAD ATTORNEY ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Philip P Caspers

Carlson Caspers Vandenburgh & Lindquist 225 S 6th St Ste 3200 Mpls, MN 55402 612-436-9617 Fax: 612-436-9605 Email: pcaspers@ccvl.com LEAD ATTORNEY ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Samuel A Hamer

Carlson Caspers Vandenburgh & Lindquist 225 S 6th St Ste 3200 Mpls, MN 55402 612-436-9600 Fax: 612-436-9605 Email: shamer@ccvl.com LEAD ATTORNEY ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Timothy A Lindquist

Carlson Caspers Vandenburgh & Lindquist 225 S 6th St Ste 3200 Mpls, MN 55402 612-436-9600 Fax: 612-436-9605 Email: tlindquist@ccvl.com LEAD ATTORNEY

- c. A judgment that Defendants ATX and PCI have infringed the '885 patent.
- d. Both preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining and restraining Defendants ATX and PCI, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys and all others acting under or through them, directly or indirectly, from infringing the '885 patent;
- e. A judgment that Defendants ATX and PCI have infringed the '210 patent.
- f. Both preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining and restraining Defendants ATX and PCI, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys and all others acting under or through them, directly or indirectly, from infringing the '210 patent;
- g. A judgment that ATX and PCI have breached the Settlement Agreement.
- h. A judgment and order requiring Defendants ATX and PCI to pay all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including treble damages if any of the infringements is determined to be willful;
- i. A judgment and order requiring Defendants ATX and PCI to pay the costs of this action, including all disbursements and attorney fees, if this case is exceptional as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 285;

- j. A judgment in an amount in excess of \$75,000 compensating

 ADC for its damages and injuries due to the Defendants' breach of the

 Settlement Agreement; and
- k. Such other and further relief that this Court may deem just and equitable.

Demand for Jury Trial

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,
Plaintiffs ADC demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

Dated: September 26, 2008 ADC Telecommunications, Inc.,

By its attorneys,

Alan G. Carlson (MN Bar No. 14,801)

Philip P. Caspers (MN Bar No. 192,569)

Timothy A. Lindquist (MN Bar No. 245,318)

Samuel A. Hamer (MN Bar No. 294,469)

James R. Hietala (MN Bar No. 386,755)

CARLSON, CASPERS, VANDENBURGH &

LINDQUIST, P.A.

225 South Sixth Street

Suite 3200

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Phone: 612-436-9600

Fax: 612-436-9605

E-mail: pcaspers@ccvl.com

<u> </u>						
			wer ^t sheet ^{iled (}	L ·	ENTOP BON 5275 INE/JUK	
The JS 44 civil cover sheet an by local rules of court. This for the civil docket sheet. (SEE)	d the information contained her firm, approved by the Judicial C INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVEL	ein neither replace nor su Conference of the United S RSE OF THE FORM.)	pplement the filing and service of States in September 1974, is requ	pleadings or other papers as re ired for the use of the Clerk of	quired by law, except as provided Court for the purpose of initiating	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS ADC Telecommunications, Inc. 13625 Technology Drive Eden Prairie, Minnesota 55344 (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			DEFENDANTS ATX Incorporated 1-501 Clements Road West Ajax, ON L1S 7H4, Canada County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam Alan G. Carlson, Philip F CARLSON, CASPERS, 225 South Sixth Street, S Minnespolis, Minnespota	ne, Address, and Telephone Numb Caspera, Timothy A. Lindquist, Sin E VANDENBURGH & LINDON Sin uite 3200 55402 612-436-960	AENED PARIS R. Highala	Attorneys (If Known) Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION (Place an "X" in	Gric Box Only)	EXPERIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place en "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	□ 1 FadamiOannian	CLERTCH	(For Diversity Cases Only)	re noe	and One Box for Defendant)	
Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	Tota Parion STATE, MINE	Citizen of This State C	I II I Incorporated or Pr of Business In This	incipal Place	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship 	of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 D 2 Incorporated and I of Business In A	rincipal Place 🗇 5 🗇 5 Another State	
			F .	3 3 Foreign Nation	06 06	
IV. NATURE OF SU	IT (Place an "X" in One Box On	ly) (数報論はCTSでEDDINANUS内で#	Samuratura VIII antica va catalogua	HEREPTOTES X STATES OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO	
D 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	O 610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	4)0 State Reapportionment	
O 120 Marine		362 Personal Injury -	1 620 Other Food & Drug	O 423 Withdrawal	O 410 Antiquest	
CJ 130 Miller Act	O 315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpractice	(1) 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	Ø 430 Banks and Banking	
140 Negotiable Instrument		365 Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 881		D 450 Commerce	
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment		Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal	O 630 Liquer Laws O 640 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	O 460 Deportation O 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
D 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Injury Product	O 650 Airline Regs.	⊠ 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations	
D 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Liability	☐ 660 Occupational	☐ 840 Trademark	1 450 Consumer Credit	
Student Loans	340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPERTY			J 450 Cable/Sat TV	
(Excl. Veterans)		370 Other Fraud	1 690 Other		310 Selective Service	
© 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits		7 371 Truth in Lending				
O 160 Stockholders' Suits	O 350 Motor Vehicle O 355 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Personal Property Damage	710 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange 3 875 Customer Challenge	
190 Other Contract		385 Property Damage	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	D 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410	
D 195 Contract Product Liability		Product Liability	730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting	0 864 SSID Title XVI	3 890 Other Statutory Actions	
O 196 Franchise	Injury	-	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts	
				O 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	892 Economic Stabilization Act	
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	O 441 Voting O 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.		O 893 Environmental Matters O 894 Energy Allocation Act	
© 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	O 443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	or Defendant) O 871 IRS—Third Party	O 895 Freedom of Information	
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	530 General		26 USC 7609	Act	
O 245 Tort Product Liability	1 444 Welfare	535 Death Penalty	Hammon Co. Co. Co. Result		900Appeal of Fee Determination	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Other		•	Under Equal Access	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	D 550 Civil Rights D 555 Prison Condition	O 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee	ł	to Justice 950 Constitutionality of	
	Other	2 22 Limot Continue	465 Other Immigration	i	State Statutes	
	3 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions			
	}				[
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	L	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) D 1 Original						
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite Jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq.						
VI CAMOR OF LOT	ION L					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause: This action includes counts for patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq. as well as both preliminary and permanent injunctions						
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Ø Yes O No						
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET SHE AN NED						
DATE			DEL OF PECODO			

SEP 2 6 2008

SEP 2 6 2008

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

<u>Defendant</u>

ATX Incorporated

<u>Defendant</u>

PCI Technologies Inc

Date Filed	# -	Docket Text
09/26/2008	1	COMPLAINT against ATX Incorporated, PCI Technologies Inc (Filing fee \$ 350 receipt number 4027085.) assigned to Judge Joan N. Ericksen per Patent list and referred to Magistrate Judge Jeffrey J. Keyes, filed by ADC Telecommunications, Inc. (Attachments: # 1 Civil Cover Sheet) (RLR) (Entered: 09/29/2008)
09/26/2008		Summons Issued as to ATX Incorporated, PCI Technologies Inc. (RLR) (Entered: 09/29/2008)
09/26/2008	2	RULE 7.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT by ADC Telecommunications, Inc. that there is no such parent or publicly held corporation to report. (RLR) (Entered: 09/29/2008)
09/29/2008		(Court only) *** Copy of complaint sent to the Patent Office. (RLR) (Entered: 09/29/2008)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

ADC Telecommunications, Inc.,) C	ivil Action No. <u>08cu 5275</u> JNE/JJK
Plaintiff,)) J	ıdge:
v.) M	ag. Judge:
ATX Incorporated and PCI Technologies Inc.,) }	Jury Trial Demanded
Defendants.)	

Complaint

This is a complaint for patent infringement and breach of contract.

Plaintiff, ADC Telecommunications, Inc. ("ADC"), for its Complaint, states as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff ADC is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Minnesota and has a principal place of business at 13625

 Technology Drive, Eden Prairie, Minnesota 55344.
- 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant, ATX Incorporated ("ATX"), is a Canadian corporation having a principal place of business at 1-501 Clements Road West, Ajax, ON L1S 7H4 Canada.

SCANNED

SEP 2 6 2000

U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUD

- 3. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PCI Technologies Inc. ("PCI"), is a Canadian corporation having a principal place of business at 1-501 Clements Road West, Ajax, ON L1S 7H4 Canada.
- 4. Upon information and belief, PCI is a wholly owned subsidiary of ATX.

Jurisdiction

- 5. This action includes counts for patent infringement under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the patent infringement counts under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 6. This action also includes a count for breach of contract. The Court has jurisdiction over the breach of contract count at least under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367(a) and 1332.

Count I Claim for Patent Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 7,197,294

- 7. Paragraphs 1-6 are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 8. ADC is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to United States Patent No. 7,197,294 ("the '294 patent") which duly and legally issued to ADC on March 27, 2007.
- 9. ADC has satisfied the notice of marking provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287.

- 10. Defendants ATX and PCI (collectively, "the Defendants") are involved in making, importing, selling and/or offering for sale RF signal
- within Defendants' MAXNET II line of products, that are covered by the

management products, including without limitation certain products

- '294 patent.
- 11. The Defendants, by their actions relating to at least their MAXNET II line of products, have directly and/or indirectly infringed the '294 patent and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.
- 12. ADC has been damaged by the Defendants' infringement of the '294 patent and will continue to be damaged in the future unless the Defendants are enjoined from infringing the '294 patent.

Count II Claim for Patent Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,885

- 13. Paragraphs 1-6 are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 14. ADC is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to United States Patent No. 6,650,885 ("the '885 patent") which duly and legally issued to ADC on November 18, 2003.
- 15. ADC has satisfied the notice or marking provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287.

- 16. The Defendants are involved in making, importing, selling and/or offering for sale RF signal management products, including without limitation certain products within Defendants' MAXNET and
- 17. The Defendants, by their actions relating to at least their MAXNET and MAXNET II line of products, have directly and/or indirectly infringed the '885 patent and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.

MAXNET II line of products, that are covered by the '885 patent.

- 18. ADC has been damaged by the Defendants' infringement of the '885 patent and will continue to be damaged in the future unless the Defendants are enjoined from infringing the '885 patent.
- 19. Upon information and belief, the Defendants' infringement of the '885 patent is willful.

Count III Claim for Patent Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,210

- 20. Paragraphs 1-6 are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 21. ADC is the owner of the entire right, title, and interest in and to United States Patent No. 6,289,210 ("the '210 patent") which duly and legally issued to ADC on September 11, 2001.
- 22. ADC has satisfied the notice or marking provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287.

- 23. The Defendants are involved in making, importing, selling and/or offering for sale RF signal management products, including without limitation certain products within Defendants' MAXNET II line of products, that are covered by the '210 patent, including at least claims 88, 90, and 91 of the '210 patent.
- 24. The Defendants, by their actions relating to at least their MAXNET II line of products, have directly and/or indirectly infringed the '210 patent and will continue to do so unless enjoined by this Court.
- 25. ADC has been damaged by the Defendants' infringement of the '210 patent and will continue to be damaged in the future unless the Defendants are enjoined from infringing the '210 patent.
- 26. Upon information and belief, the Defendants' infringement of the '210 patent is willful.

Count IV Claim for Breach of Contract

- 27. Paragraphs 1-6 and 20-26 are incorporated into this count by reference.
- 28. On October 23, 2002, ADC and PCI entered into a written
 Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement") to end a prior litigation
 in which ADC accused PCI of infringing the '210 patent.

- 29. The Settlement Agreement constitutes a binding contract between PCI and ADC.
- 30. In Paragraph 13 of the Settlement Agreement, PCI agreed that the "Settlement Agreement shall be governed in all respects by the laws of the State of Minnesota without regard to choice of law analysis."
- 31. ADC has fully performed its duties under the Settlement Agreement including filing a stipulated dismissal of ADC's claims in the prior litigation as required by Paragraph 1 of the Settlement Agreement.
- 32. In Paragraph 2 of the Settlement Agreement, PCI agreed "not to make, sell or offer for sale in the United States, for the life of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,210 B1, the MAXNET modules of Exhibits 1 and 2 of this Settlement Agreement or any other modules that infringe asserted claims 88, 90 and 91 of the '210 patent, except as such modules may be modified as described under paragraph 5."
- 33. As more fully set forth in paragraphs 20–26 above, PCI, through making, selling, and/or offering for sale certain modules within its MAXNET II line of products, infringes claims 88, 90, and 91 of the '210 patent.

- 34. The modules in PCI's MAXNET II line that infringe at least claims 88, 90, and 91 of the '210 patent do not fall within any of the exceptions allowed under paragraphs 2 and/or 5 of the Settlement Agreement.
- 35. Through its manufacture, sale and/or offer for sale of its MAXNET II line of products, PCI has breached the Settlement Agreement and is therefore liable to ADC for damages in excess of \$75,000.
- 36. On information and belief, ATX is PCI's successor in interest and is therefore liable for the harm caused by the breach of the Settlement Agreement.

Demand for Relief

ADC respectfully demands the following relief:

- a. A judgment that Defendants ATX and PCI have infringed the '294 patent.
- b. Both preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining and restraining Defendants ATX and PCI, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys and all others acting under or through them, directly or indirectly, from infringing the '294 patent;